

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-19 are pending herein.

I. The obviousness rejections of claims 9-15 based on Sasaki (US 6,357,514) and Zeighami (US 2003/0183371), as noted on page 2 of the Office Action.

The USPTO respectfully rejects Claims 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Zeighami. Claim 9 is an independent claim.

A. The cited references do not teach or suggest that each of the slits has a substantially same width corresponding to a thickness of the fins such that the slits are substantially filled by the fins, as claimed in claim 9.

Claim 9 claims in relevant part:

“each of said slits has a substantially same width corresponding to a thickness of said fins such that **said slits are substantially filled by said fins.**” (emphasis added)

No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found in original claims 10-12, present Figures 6-8, and on page 8 of the present specification. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where the cited references teach or suggest the claimed structure quoted above.

For example, the USPTO respectfully argues on page 2 of the Office Action that Sasaki teaches a plurality of slits 12 and plurality of fins 21. However, as clearly seen in Figures 1 and 3 of Sasaki, slits 12 are not substantially filled by fins 21. Instead, **as seen in Figure 3 of Sasaki, large portions of slits 12 are open space, i.e., not filled by fins 21.** Therefore, Sasaki respectfully does not teach or suggest that each of the slits has a substantially same width corresponding to a thickness of the fins such that the slits are substantially filled by the fins, as claimed in claim 9.

Additionally, Zeighami does not overcome this deficiency in the primary reference Sasaki. Specifically, Zeighami is only cited for allegedly teaching a fin-fixing member to

transfix the plurality of metal fins, and it respectfully does not teach or suggest anything about slits being substantially filled by the fins, as claimed in claim 9.

In contrast, present Figures 6-8 illustrate at least one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. For example, present Figures 6-8 shows heat dissipating portions 4 (i.e., fins) that are inserted through slits 10. As explained in page 8 of the present specification, slits 10 have a width corresponding to the thickness of heat dissipating portions 4. Thus, as seen in Figures 6-8, **heat dissipating portions 4 substantially fill slits 10 because the width of slits 10 corresponds to the thickness of heat dissipating portions 4.** For example, Figures 6-8 show no space between heat dissipating portions 4 and upper portion 9 of metal plate member 7. In other words, there is a substantial sealing or tight coupling of upper portion 9 and heat dissipating portions 4 inserted through slits 10. Thus, slits 10 are substantially filled by fins 4, as claimed in claim 9.

The distinction noted above is important and non-trivial because it results in significant advantages over conventional structures. For example, when the slits are substantially filled by the fins, as claimed in claim 9, no significant electromagnetic or radio waves are able to pass through the structure. Thus, **interference with the built-in electronics can be reduced using the specifically claimed structure of claim 9.** In contrast, with the device of Sasaki, the mountain-shaped or corrugated fins 21 have a hollow tunnel-like space through which radio waves can pass, and thus there may be interference with the built-in electronics.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 9. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 9 is allowable.

B. The cited references do not teach or suggest a first concave portion on a top side of metal shield plate that is aligned with a second concave portion on a bottom side of the metal shield plate, as claimed in claim 9.

Claim 9 claims in relevant part:

“a metal shield plate having a plurality of slits including linear and/or curved portions into which said respective fins are inserted along said slits, and press-connected to said fins by forming a first concave portion on a top side of said metal shield plate, a second concave portion on a bottom side of said metal shield plate, and an enlarged portion at the edge of said metal shield plate ~~on a top side and a bottom side of said metal shield plate~~, wherein **said first concave portions portion is aligned with said second concave portion are opposed to each other at a given position** on the metal shield plate;,” (emphasis added)

No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amendments is found in present Figure 7 and on pages 12-13 of the present specification. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where the cited references teach or suggest the claimed structure quoted above.

Specifically, the USPTO respectfully argues on pages 2-3 of the Office Action that Figure 8 of Sasaki (cited as POA Fig 1) teaches a concave portion on top of a plate and a concave portion on the bottom of the plate. However, it is respectfully asserted that Sasaki does not teach or suggest that a first concave portion (on a top side of the plate) is aligned with a second concave portion (on a bottom side of the plate), as claimed in claim 9. Instead, as clearly seen in Figure 8 of Sasaki (i.e., POA Fig. 1), **the concave portion on top of the plate is located at approximately the center of the plate, while the concave portion on the bottom of the plate is displaced to the side.** Therefore, the top concave portion is not aligned with the bottom concave portion, as claimed in claim 9.

Additionally, Zeighami does not overcome this deficiency in the primary reference Sasaki. Specifically, Zeighami is only cited for allegedly teaching a fin-fixing member to transfix the plurality of metal fins, and it respectfully does not teach or suggest anything about concave portions on the base member.

In contrast, present Figure 7 illustrates one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. Specifically, present Figure 7 shows the heat dissipating portion 4 of a fin inserted through a slit in the upper portion 9 of a metal shield plate 7. The fin and the metal shield plate are fixed together by forming concave portions 14 on the metal shield plate close to the fin. In particular, a first concave portion is formed on a top side of the metal shield plate, and a second concave portion is formed on a bottom side of the metal shield plate. **As seen in present Figure 7, the first concave portion (on the top side) is aligned with the second concave portion (on the bottom side),** as claimed in claim 9.

The distinction noted above is important and non-trivial because it results in significant inherent advantages over conventional structures. For example, Applicants respectfully note that the mountain-shaped fin in Sasaki is difficult to fabricate and fit to the base member. In contrast, the structure of claim 9 provides an advantage in that it is easier to manufacture and assemble.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claimed limitations of claim 9. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 9 is not obvious over the cited references.

C. The dependent claims.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 9 is allowable, and therefore it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 10-15 are also allowable.

II. New claim 19.

Applicant respectfully notes that new claim 19 has been added. No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the new claim is found in original claims 9-12, present Figures 6-8, and on pages 7-8 of the present specification.

III. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: / Daniel P. Lent / _____
Daniel P. Lent
Registration No. 44,867

Date: November 24, 2008
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413